

Japanese Telephone Openings: Both Universal and Culturally Determined

Lori Ann Desrosiers

Telephone openings constitute a very small part of the overall conversation that takes place on the telephone. However, they have generated some controversy among researchers who have studied this topic. One view is that telephone openings consist of a relatively small number of exchanges, many of which are formulaic in nature and seem to follow a set, orderly pattern in order to reach the topic of conversation (Hopper, 1992, Scollon, 1993). The same researchers posit that cultural differences are the result of linguistic diversity. Another view is that there is much diversity between cultures as to the specific rituals, which must be performed before arriving at a topic (Godard, 1977, Sifianou, 1989). These researchers claim that the differences are the result of cultural norms and can cause cross-cultural miscommunication; thus they are distinct enough to be considered on their own. This study will investigate the universal/cultural issue in greater depth and investigate the Japanese language in terms of this issue.

Telephone openings: Universal or Culturally determined?

A major goal in the study of language is to find universalities or generalizations that span languages. Telephone openings may have achieved this goal. Interested in the phenomena of conversational openings and the role of identification/recognition as a key element to dictate social behavior, Schegloff (1979) studied telephone openings as a way of isolating this element. Upon reinvestigation of the literature, it seems that it is interpretation of his work by others, which has led to the conclusion that there is a basic pattern involved in telephone opening discourse.

Scollon (1993), for example, identified three central tasks, which need to be accomplished prior to embarking on any particular topic of either of the interlocutors. These tasks are: 1) open the channel of communication, 2) constitute or reconstitute the relationship between the interlocutors, and 3) move to the topic which will be talked about. There are three coordinating sequences to realize the tasks linguistically. These are: 1) the summons-answer sequence, 2) the identification sequence and 3) the introduction of topic sequence. A model sample referred to as 'canonical' (Schegloff, 1986, 115, in Hopper, 1992) follows:

- R Hello
- C Hello Ida?
- R Yeah
- C Hi,=This is Carla
- R Hi Carla.
- C How are you.
- R Okay:.
- C Good.=
- R =How about you.
- C Fine. Don wants to know...

Hopper, 1992, makes a further claim for the universality of telephone openings. He states that there are four tasks required to successfully open the conversation. These are: 1) the summons-answer sequence, 2) mutual recognition displays are the first-next business in-and-after summoning and answering, 3) greetings between acquaintances immediately upon recognition, and 4) movement into the topic typically by means of initial inquiry by the caller. It seems that Hopper has expanded the second task by

distinguishing greetings within the identification task.

Various languages and cultures diverge from the canonical telephone opening listed above. The studies by Godard (1977), Schmidt (1986), Sifianou (1989) and Houtkoop-Steenstra (1991) are important works because they are reminders of the complexity of the language-culture relationship even in such a trivial speech event as a telephone opening. Sifianou (1989) argues that culture determines the approach to and the attitudes towards the telephone. She states that, "they are not independent of the cultural system which informs them and, consequently, should not be seen simply as related to the specific speech event" (p.541). In her study, she contrasted Greek and English telephone openings, identifying Greek culture as a positive politeness society and English culture as a negative politeness society (Brown & Levinson, 1987 in Sifianou, 1989). In a positive politeness society the degree of disturbance of telephone calls is low whereas for a negative politeness society it is high (1989). The linguistic realizations (such as the broad range of answers available to Greek answerers as opposed to the "hallo" of the English callers and the absence of identification by Greek callers and answerers as opposed to explicit identification by either or both of the English callers and answerers) she claims, stem from cultural values which are starkly different enough that cross-cultural miscommunication would result when transferring norms (1989).

Along the same lines, Godard (1977) studied French and American telephone openings. She argued "the roles of 'caller' and 'answerer' go beyond the physical properties of the situation and are given an interpretation by the culture, as part of a specific speech event" (p. 216). She discovered that telephone openings are subject to societal rules governing telephone openings when they were violated while she was in America. Particularly troublesome for her was that the American caller, recognizing that he/she has not reached the intended party, treats the answerer in something akin to what Schegloff (1979) terms a "switchboard request" whereas a French caller who has not reached his or her intended addressee must

engage in conversation with the answerer (1977). Unfortunately, Godard's study falls short in the same way that Sifianou's does. She does not provide tape-recorded data and her examples are from intuition and introspection.

Hopper (1992) agrees that telephone openings in a variety of languages as well as within languages are divergent situationally. Different cultures say things differently but they can be explained with reference to the task/sequence pattern. For example, the Houtkoop-Steenstra (1991) study of Dutch telephone openings does not so much conclude that they do not follow the three task pattern as that within the pattern they are culturally contextualized. He points out that the different first answers available to Greek callers in Sifianou's study (which she argues reflect the openness of the culture) are "as different *from each other* as they are from English comparisons" (italics in the original) (p.85). Therefore, variability of opening phrases shows only that there is linguistic diversity in the way a telephone is answered and they accomplish the same objective, which is to open the channel (1992). Greek callers and answerers prefer to identify each other by voice sample (Sifianou, 1989). Considering that Greek callers do not use the telephone for other than social purposes (1989), there is a rather limited possibility of who the potential caller is, thus there is a built in intimacy factor. Then, is the societal rule of 'social calls only' a reflection of deeper cultural values? Hopper (1992) would argue that "no" it is merely a situation that exists in that culture but that the calls that are made follow the universal pattern. That the French callers must apologize for their intrusion can be explained as 'establishing the relationship' (Scollon, 1993). Difficult to explain by the three-task universal is the obligation of French callers to converse with the answerer who is not the intended addressee. Hopper's (1992) view is that it is a situational norm, in this case the degree of relationship of the caller and answerer. A question arises as to at what point does a situational norm look more like the cultural norms with roots in cultural values that Sifianou and Godard discuss?

Sifianou's argument is persuasive and intuitively acceptable. It is unfortunate that she felt that systematically collecting data by tape-recording telephone openings "was not deemed necessary or desirable" (1989, p. 528). It is unfortunate because tape-recorded data could have given readers a better conceptualization of what she was discussing and/or her data could have been subject to further analysis, which may have shed supportive light on the topic. Godard's study (1977) falls short in much the same way because there is no tape-recorded authentic data and examples are from intuition and introspection. In this way, the Houtkoop-Steenstra study, which does provide tape-recorded data, is a better study because it provides material to support her discussion and makes at least some of the material available for inspection. Moreover, while Houtkoop-Steenstra claims that Dutch openings do not follow the sequence of openings of American telephone openings, she admits that all aspects of the sequence are present but that they are accomplished in a briefer manner (1991).

Both arguments are reasonable, and it is impossible to entirely dismiss one or the other. The answer to the question of universality versus cultural specificity seems to be "Yes"; that telephone openings are universal and culturally specific at the same time. Scollon (1993) in his *Maxims of Stance* paper explains that studies of culture tend to suggest exclusivity. For instance, if a particular culture X does a particular behavior, Y, no other culture does that behavior. However, by looking at business telephone openings, essays by Chinese students, and Asian-English discourse, he found evidence that three 'enclosing frames' were in operation in all cases. These are: 1) establishing the channel, 2) establishing the relationship within the channel and 3) establishing the topic. Therefore, the link between cultures is that using different linguistic devices, they arrive at the topic in the same basic way. While this seems obviously true, it does not seem to satisfy, really, the fact that differences do exist. What is needed is to provide explanations of a wider variety of languages based upon evidence from tape-recorded data.

Japanese telephone openings

I will look at two sources to obtain background information about Japanese telephone openings. The first is a number of Japanese textbooks for non-native speakers of Japanese. While recognizing the limitation of textbooks to provide authentic language, they cannot be dismissed as a source since they provide the only available information on this topic. The second is from written recordings made by Japanese colleagues. This source is closer to reality. However, there may be flaws because in writing the conversation the participant may have deleted or added information. This could be caused by the speed at which the exchanges took place. Another cause could be if the participant waited until the end of the call and wrote down the opening from memory. In the present study, naturally occurring data will be used to explore and explain telephone openings in the Japanese language.

Thus far I have established that telephone openings follow a patterned sequence of events. This pattern crosses languages such as Greek, French and Dutch among others. The following discussion regarding Japanese will be set in the framework of the three events which account for a universal order in which all discourse follows. These are: 1) Opening the channel, 2) Establishing the relationship within the channel and 3) Establishing the topic.

Opening the channel

The first part of any telephone conversation is the opening of the channel through the summons-answer sequence. The ring of the telephone is considered to be a summons (Schegloff, 1972), which initiates the interaction. The person being summoned can disregard the summons in the case of the telephone but this is rarely the case. Speakers enter into the conversation not knowing each other's identity. In this case, the caller does have the advantage in that he or she knows the party he/she is trying to reach, but there is not always a guarantee that person is the one who will answer the phone. The answerer, on the other hand, has almost no knowledge as to who is

calling although Schegloff (1979) maintains that there are not an unlimited number of possibilities. Most answerers have a pool of potential callers.

The summons-answer sequence developed as a result of a deviant case in Schegloff's (1972) corpus. The rule "the answerer speaks first", known as the distribution rule, became framed within a broader rule of conversation. A summons, whether by telephone or not, has an obligatory response (1972). In face-to-face communication, the adjacency pair response may be a looking up motion or a "yes" uttered of someone whose name has been called, (Schegloff, 1972). In telephone communication, the usual response or sequential partner to the summons in English is "hello?" (Schegloff, 1972). If the summons is not answered verbally then the caller will repeat the summons, although this time it is not with the mechanically produced ring but with a lexical item such as "hello" marked with a rising intonation. Furthermore, the summons-answer sequence also accounts for another rule that 'the caller provides the first topic'.

It is not known if the Japanese caller's first "moshi moshi" as the first utterance of the telephone opening is a reissuing of the summons (1972) or if it is a checking of the channel (Scollon, 1993) or if it is a cultural convention. Trudgill (1974) states that Japanese answerers "expect the caller to speak first" (p. 130), thus casting doubt on both the distribution rule which holds that the answerer speaks first and the SA rule which holds that answering the summons is obligatory. In other words, callers intentionally speaking first do not fit the SA sequence because they seem not to be reissuing the summons. Because Trudgill does not provide any information regarding his statement, I sought out whether there is any basis of the caller speaking first. A native Japanese informant has told me that in some cases, Japanese answerers wait for the caller to speak first and a native English speaking informant has told me that she has noticed that a native speaking Japanese caller does not wait for the answerer to speak first.

In Hough's *Telephone Japanese* textbook for non-native speakers of Japanese there are example

telephone calls to residences and businesses. The examples to residences are few and indicate that the answerer does take the first turn prescribed in Schegloff's distribution rule (1979). However, in one example of a business call, the caller spoke first. Other textbooks for non-native speakers also indicate that the caller may make the first turn. The written recordings I collected also indicate that there may be an option for Japanese callers with respect to the distribution rule but not overwhelmingly so. The following two examples, I.1 and II.2, show violation of the distribution rule:

M(caller) Moshi moshi
(hello)

Y hello

M Okoshichatta?
(Did I wake you?)

S(caller) Hiroshi-san, ogenki! Kyou ranchi wa aite iru no.

Moshi hima ga attara ranchi issho ni dou desu ka....
(Hiroshi, how are you? I'm free for lunch today. If you are free how about having lunch together?)

Both of these examples may still adhere to the summons-answer formulation by reissuing the summons. But this is difficult to conclude without knowing such factors as intonation of the interlocutors, or if there were any pauses or gaps in the flow of talk. For the written recordings, it is entirely possible that the informants failed to write the answerer's first response.

Establishing the relationship within the channel

Establishing the relationship and identification of the conversation partners can be completed in the summons-answer sequence. One possibility for this is that the caller recognizes the voice of the answerer. In this case, the speakers are thought to be intimate. In Schmidt's 1986 study we see Egyptian callers and answerers attempting and practically insisting on voice identification through a series of exchanged "alo"s. When this strategy did not succeed, the caller then the

answerer requested the identity of each other. Finally, identities were arrived at through guessing. According to the written recordings of the Japanese speakers in the appendix, voice recognition by the caller, answerer or both is possible but does not seem prevalent. Additionally, the textbooks gave no examples of participants recognizing each other's voices.

Another possibility for completion of mutual identification within the summons-answer sequence is that either the answerer or the caller will identify him/herself early on. Dutch answerers, for example, in Houtkoop-Steenstra's study (1991) identify themselves by saying their name on the first turn. French callers are responsible to clear up this information deficit by checking the number and at first opportunity, identify themselves (Godard, 1977). In the case of Japanese, the answerer may identify him/herself in the first turn as in examples III 1 and 2 of the appendix, "Hai. Banno desu" (Yes. This is Banno) and "Hai. Soeya desu" (Yes. This is Soeya). Or the caller may verify his/her guess by asking the name of the answerer as in this example from the appendix (I. 5):

M Hello.
K Miki san.
(Miki?)

According to the textbooks for non-native speakers, if the Japanese answerer does not identify him/herself then the caller would be responsible for inquiring if he has reached his/her intended addressee. But it seems that identification/recognition is expected before the conversation moves forward.

Frequently greetings are incorporated or added to the identification sequence, as in this example from Schegloff (1979) 59:

M Hello?
G Hello it's me.
M Hi.

G identifies him/herself on the assumption that M will recognize "me" by the voice and offers greetings as

well. Schegloff (1979) states that either speaker will not offer greetings unless recognition has been accomplished. This is problematic however, because there are cases of "deception" in which the answerer may greet even though he/she has not recognized the voice of the caller (1972). Deceptions can at times be identified when the answerer immediately or sometime later interjects an "Oh, Hi____" indicating "just now" recognition (1972). Otherwise, deceptions go undetected until perhaps there is a breakdown (which seems inevitable) once the topic is embarked upon.

The first "hello", according to Schegloff (1979) is not a greeting but the answer to the summons of the ring. The answerer, in his/her next turn will offer a greeting very often with the word "hi". This word is considered to be an informal "hello" but is never used as the answer to the summons. On the other hand, it is interchangeable in the greeting sequence, as indicated by the example above. For Japanese speakers, a similar situation may exist. The "moshi moshi" by the answerer is a response to the summons. The caller's first turn "moshi moshi" can be considered a greeting if it is the obligatory next turn after the answerer. However if the caller's first "moshi moshi" is the first utterance it is not known whether it is a reissuing of the summons (Schegloff, 1972) or if it is a checking of the channel (Scollon, 1993) or if it is a cultural convention.

Within the framework, establishing the relationship will be an important aspect to study with respect to Japanese. It is widely known that members of the Japanese society function in a complex, hierarchical network of relations. They must be particularly sensitive to their role as defined by the person with whom one is speaking. Thus, establishing identities is a very serious matter and impacts greatly on the next segment, *establishing the topic*.

Establishing the topic

Once the relationship between speakers has been established the topic of the call is introduced. Typically it is the caller who introduces the topic but this is not necessarily so. An initial inquiry routine

such as the question, "how are you?" and the default response, "fine" provides an entry into the topic (Hopper, 1992) as in the example given on page 2. However, the answerer may provide a different response creating a topic of his/her own. Similarly Egyptian callers follow this ritual of inquiring with a "how are you" routine (Schmidt, 1986). In Japanese, before getting to the topic or before initiating a topic either the caller or answerer might thank his/her partner for some item or behavior that he/she received previous to the call thereby expressing indebtedness to that person (Coulmas, 1981). This behavior is not limited to phone calls but is used in face-to-face interaction as described by Coulmas (1981). It may be a reference to a letter or phone call. Another preliminary could be an apology as in apologizing for having no contact for so long or to express gratitude noting the trouble caused to the benefactor (1981).

These thanks and apologies consist of standard phrases, one of which is "kono aida... arigatou gozaimasu" (about that thing or behavior the time before, thank you). This phrase is the first part of an adjacency pair. The second part is "iie kochira koso" (not at all, it is you who should be thanked). There is some variation in the words spoken but most variation is in the use of the humble or honorific forms that are appropriate to the hearer (Goldstein and Tamura, 1975). One textbook addresses this formula. It adds that even when no particular act or favor has been received, the phrase serves to remind the speakers of the last time they met (Brown, 1987).

Rationale for the study

Most researchers who have done work on this topic agree with Schegloff's proposition that the answerer speaks first (Sifianou, 1989, Godard, 1977, Hopper, 1992, Schmidt, 1986, Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991). Based on the above discussion of Japanese telephone openings, it would seem that they follow the basic framework of telephone openings as outlined by Scollon (1993) and Hopper (1992). However, there seems to be a possibility that the callers do speak first. If this is so, are there any particular instances

where the caller speaks first, or is it random? If Japanese answerers do in fact wait for the caller to speak first, is the caller speaking first a reissuing of the summons or a truly unique cultural phenomena? What would this phenomenon be? If they do wait, how long is the wait time? The first step is to analyze data from naturally occurring conversations to see if Japanese speakers falsify the SA sequence.

As interesting as investigating if Japanese callers falsify the sequence of summons-answer is how telephone conversations are opened within this specific cultural context. Without collecting naturally occurring data, this discussion would be subject to the same criticisms stated earlier of the Sifianou and Godard studies. Therefore, although I have described Japanese telephone openings by way of textbook information and written recordings by Japanese speakers, data from naturally occurring openings will provide a better base from which to describe them. The broad research question in this case is how do Japanese speakers open telephone conversations? And more specifically, is a reference phrase giving thanks or apologies a ritual event? If so, does this event depend on age, gender or relationship (family member, friend, acquaintance) of the interlocutors?

Method

Data collection

Keeping with the presuppositions of discourse and conversational analysis, this research will collect naturalistic data of Japanese telephone-openings. These openings will be tape-recorded using an ARCHER telephone electronic eavesdropping device. This device starts and stops automatically as the receiver is lifted off and replaced on the telephone mechanism so it is quite easy to operate. At any time, pressing the "stop" button on the recorder can terminate the taping.

The subjects taped their telephone openings for a period of about two weeks. It may have been possible to have collected a specific and larger number of openings in a shorter period of time had I designed and implemented role-playing as the method of data-collection. The drawback of this method as discussed

in the literature on role-play is that the data collected would be inherently artificial although it seems that there does not exist a study that compares role-play data with naturalistic data (Hull, 1986). A future study regarding this issue would help to enrich our understanding of the relationship between the two.

The method of using an electronic eavesdropping device to record and collect speech from the telephone has legal implications that are worth noting here. Prior to taping, I consulted the Statutes of Hawaii, the University of Hawaii at Manoa's School of Law, and GTE Hawaiian Telephone Company regarding the use of electronic eavesdropping devices. The result of the inquiry was that if one member of the taping was aware of the taping, the taping is not illegal. Furthermore, a recent case involving the taping of telephone conversations has revealed in this quote by lawyer Jeff Portnoy that "Federal law and the law in 40 states allows one party to a conversation to record or transmit a conversation without telling the other party. It is considered to be no more intrusive than orally retelling a conversation to a third person" (Rosegg, 1993).

Materials

The subjects were given an acknowledgment of their participation and instructions sheet in both Japanese and English. The purpose of the sheet was to acknowledge their agreement to participate, reiterate the purpose of the study, to assure the anonymity of all persons tape-recorded and to instruct them to gain the approval of their conversation partner. They were also given sheets written in Japanese on which they were instructed to write down/check off relevant information about the telephone call. This information will help to categorize who the speakers are, which speaker was the caller/receiver, and the relationship between the speakers.

Procedures

The goal of the method of data collection is to capture language in naturally occurring settings. Therefore, there are no specific procedures to follow

to obtain the data. However, because of the legal issues involved, the participants have very specific instructions to follow while collecting data. The first instruction is to notify their conversation partner that they are being taped for research purposes. They are to obtain permission for the use of the telephone recordings and to insure the anonymity of their partner. Once permission is granted and the conversation has moved through the opening sequences to the first topic of the call, they are to turn off the tape-recorder. If permission has been denied, then any and all parts of that conversation are to be erased by re-winding the tape and recording over it. These instructions have been given verbally and in written form. They are described in further detail in the materials section.

Subjects

There are a total of 6 native speaking Japanese participants in the study. They are separated into two groups. These groups do not know each other so that the calls will not be duplicated or counted twice. One group consists of a family of four; mother and father (40's) and two daughters (18 and 20 years of age). All of the members in this family have been living in Honolulu for approximately three years. The father works for a Japanese company, the mother is not employed but keeps active with other members of the Japanese community and the two daughters attend a public high school. They were asked to participate in the study because to a great extent their network of friends and acquaintances are Japanese so that when it comes to the telephone they answer and begin the calls in Japanese.

The other group is a married couple in their early 40's. The husband is a visiting scholar and the wife is a graduate student. They have been in Hawaii for about three months. They were asked to participate in this study because although both fluent in English, they make and receive a greater proportion of calls in Japanese than those they make and receive in English.

One problem that occurs with the method of collecting naturalistic data is that, especially in this case,

the number of participants is small. The categories of members of society are even less; 1) two females in their 40's, 2) two males in their 40's and 3) two teenage females. Using role-play as the method of data collection may have increased the range of representation because the roles could have been set to cover a number of different age, gender and social class combinations. However, as noted previously, the drawback is the presumed artificiality of role-play.

The participants in the study are not aware of the purpose of the study. By the questions they asked about what they were supposed to do and the explanations they gave when I went to retrieve the data, it was obvious that they were concerned with the type of language they used, who they spoke to and whether their calls were appropriate for my study. For example, they asked if they could speak to their friends and if they did, they probably wouldn't be speaking very "nicely".

Results

A total of 34 telephone openings were tape-recorded (see Appendix). There were twelve calls where the caller did not reach the intended addressee. Of these twelve, there were nine times when the intended addressee was available and thus became a "second answerer". Twenty-three of the calls were between female interlocutors, three between male interlocutors, and eight between female - male interlocutors. Seventeen of the calls made were between friends, two between family members and the rest were an assortment ranging between business colleagues or acquaintances, teachers and a neighbor.

The data suggest a general pattern of Japanese telephone openings. The answerer speaks first, responding to the summons. There was only one case where the caller spoke first. Next, the caller and answerer set about establishing identities, followed by an exchange of greetings of "konnichiwa", "konbanwa" or "ohayou gozaimasu" (hello, hello and good morning). It was interesting that this exchange of greetings was sequential in essence but often was carried out in overlapping speech. Finally, the caller

brings up the topic, which he/she signals by the use of "ano". When the call is for someone other than the answerer, a similar pattern exists with minor revision. It occurred less that "first answerers" exchanged greetings with the callers (four times out of twelve). When the intended person was called to the phone this "second answerer" also spoke first but the establishing of identities was cut and the speakers went directly to exchanging greetings. As would be expected, if the intended person was not available, then no topic was brought up. When the intended person or "second answerer" got on the phone, it was the caller who brought up the topic as indicated by the pattern previously explained.

It has been discussed that expressions of thanks or apology are a part of the Japanese greeting. In thirteen of the 34 calls, nine callers thanked their answerers for some past action or continued kindness, two answerers thanked their callers, and two callers apologized. Most of the thanks was reciprocated with denial of deserving the thanks with the phrase "iie, iie, kochira koso" or "no, really, it is you who deserves the thanks". This expression of thanks with the reciprocal phrase also was noted to occur in overlapping speech. Of the eleven cases of thanks the relationships of the speakers showed four friends, and eight other types of relations (neighbor, or husband's business acquaintance), while there were no cases of family relations. There was a fairly even split of younger people giving thanks to older people (5), and vice versa (6). Of the two apologies one was given to an older colleague and the other to an older business acquaintance.

Discussion

As the results indicate, it seems that Japanese callers do not speak first, are not expected to speak first, and overall do not falsify the SA sequence. However, there was one instance where the caller did speak first. It did not seem that the caller was "checking the channel" since there was no perceived difference in the length of time between when the phone was picked up to when the first words were spoken.

Call #23

C - M: Moshi moshi.

Hello.

A - S: Hai.

Yes.

C - M: Ah, sumimasen. Ohayou gozaimasu.

Oh, excuse me. Good morning.

A - S:

[

Ohayou

gozaimasu.

Goodmorning.

C - M: Oshima desu. Ano ne Kobayashi san....

This is Oshima. Umm Kobayashi.....

[

A - S:

Ah!

If it were truly an unusual occurrence then perhaps some kind of repair work would need to be done to get back to the expected pattern of behavior. There was no obvious repair work by either answerer or caller. It may be that the caller's "excuse me" is repairing but its use suggests more a "sorry for bothering you" intention. It seems that, in this case, it was the lack of establishing identities, which threw the conversation off more than the caller speaking first as noted by the answerer's "Ah!" Thus, the fact that the caller spoke first may be acceptable and perhaps optional even though not the normal routine.

Japanese is considered to be a highly polite language, using expressions of gratitude and apology in customary greetings (Coulmas, 1981). However, contrary to what was expected, these expressions were hardly used with friends and none with family members. There were only two calls made between family members and these were from the same group of subjects. Moreover, the same two people; the husband and wife made them. With so few and so narrow a sample, it is impossible to conclude that family members do not express thanks. It may change when speaking with in-laws, as was the case with one of

the examples in the written recorded data.

Call # 25 (husband and wife)

A - S: Hai.

Hello.

C - T: Moshi moshi.

Hello.

A - S: Hai.

Hi.

C - T: Otoosan da kedo.

It's Dad.

A - S: Uun.

Yeah.

C - T: Ano ne... hachiji han goro owaru kara sa...

Umm...I'll be finished around 8:30 so...

Of the calls in which these expressions were present, the results might indicate that they were determined by the factor of social relationship. Of a total of fifteen calls made between those other than family or friend, in ten cases (or two-thirds), thanks or apology was expressed and five cases where no thanks or apology was offered to those in this other group. There were no cases where these expressions were given without the establishing of identities, thus, reinforcing the three part conversational sequence with the cultural aspect. They are greetings as Coulmas pointed out (1981), but they are not always present nor are they always required. Thus, they are an extra-greeting.

Greetings and the other formulaic expressions were often overlapping and predictable. Perhaps because of the predictability there was overlap. The speakers anticipate a greeting from within a limited number of possibilities and can automatically reciprocate it within a syllable's time of the initial utterance. The speakers also need very little time when offering denial and counter thanks to the speaker who offered thanks.

Call #1

A - S: Hello.

C - K: Moshi moshi. Sumida?

Hello. Sumida?

A - S: Hai.

Yes.

C - K: Saka desu. Konbanwa.

It's Saka. Hello.

[

A - S:

Konbanwa.

Kinou wa doumo arigatou gozaimashita.

Hello.

Thank you so much for yesterday.

[

C - K:

Iie, iie. Kochira koso. Ano...

No, really. Thank you..Umm...

This example is an excellent example of the general pattern of Japanese telephone conversation openings. The SA sequence is fulfilled. Then once the speakers establish identities they exchange greetings. The speaker who fulfills the sequence of the greetings pair then extends the greeting by initiating the next sequence of thanks with its counterpart of denial. Lastly, the coming of the topic is signaled by "ano", translated as "umm".

Friends, it was mentioned, do not offer each other gratitude or apology expressions. The preferred pattern between friends is to establish identities, offer greetings and then move to topic. Voice recognition did not occur in most of the calls, which was the expected outcome. It occurred in only four calls. Recall that voice recognition was a sign of intimacy and that these results are showing a possible dispreference for intimacy. This would be consistent with Brown & Levinson's discussion of Japanese society as being negatively polite (1987, in Sifianou, 1989).

Godard would have the same complaint to raise against Japanese callers who do not reach their intended addressee as she did to American callers. Since there is hardly the occurrence of an exchange of greetings, there is no exchange of small talk except in the rare occurrence as in call #3. The answerer acts, in Godard's terms, as "an extension of the telephone itself" (1977).

Call #23

A - R: Hai, moshi moshi.

Yes. Hello?

C - L: Murata desu kedomo.

This is Murata.

A - R: Hai.

Yes.

C - L: Yuki-san....

Yuki...

A - R: Hai, chotto matte ne?

Yeah, hold on a minute okay?

C - L: Hai.

All right.

There are quite a few limitations to this study. The corpus of data is small and the situations are varied so that the discussion focuses on a few examples. I cannot make many generalizations but one thing can be said is that there were no major surprises. Japanese speakers follow the three part sequence in conversational openings and do so with very little linguistic variation. Also, as expected, the Japanese use the formulaic speech patterns of giving thanks or apology on the phone as well as in face-to-face communication. It seems that it may be the responsibility of the caller to offer the thanks more than the receiver of the call. This might be different than face-to-face meetings if the reason is just to establish rapport. The surprise with formulaic expressions of thanks and apology was that they did not show up in more calls, meaning that they were not the greeting itself.

電話での会話の初めの部分は、会話全体のごく1部分にすぎない。しかし、研究者の間ではいくらか論争を引き起こしてきた。ある見解は、電話会話の冒頭は、比較的少ないやり取りだけであり、それも本質的に形式的なもので、会話の本題に至るための、決められたパターンに従うものだとする（ホッパー、1992、スコロン、1993）。

こうした見解を唱える研究者は、様々な文化の違いは言語学上の多様性から発生すると仮定している。別の見解は、特定の儀礼について文化的にかなり多様性があり、会話の本題に至るまえにこうした儀礼

が行われなければならないとしている。(ゴダード、1977、シフィアノウ、1989)。こうした見解を唱える研究者は、様々な違いは各々の文化が持つ規範の結果であり、異文化間コミュニケーション上の障害を引き起こすと主張している。この論文は、こうした普遍的／文化的な問題をより深く追求し、この問題と関連づけて日本語を考察するものである。

References

- Brown, D. (1987). An introduction to advanced spoken Japanese.
Yokohama: Inter-University Center for Japanese Language Studies.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, F. (1981). "Poison to Your Soul" - Thanks and apologies contrastively viewed. In F. Coulmas (ed.), Conversational routine: explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech.
The Hague: Mouton.
- Godard, D. (1977). Same setting, different norms: Phone call beginnings in France and the United States. Language in Society 6, 209-219.
- Goldstein, B. & Tamura K. (1975). Japan and America. Tokyo: Tuttle.
- Hopper, R. (1992). Telephone Conversation. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hough, D. (1988). Moshi moshi: Telephone Japanese. Tokyo: The Japan Times.
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1991). Opening sequences in Dutch telephone conversations. In D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (eds.), Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hull, J. (1986). Role-play activities in second language teaching: development, implementation and evaluation. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu.
- Rosegg, P. (1993, October 29). Blair's phone-taping not illegal. The Honolulu Advertiser, pp. 1, 7.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Sequencing in conversational openings. In J.J. Gumperz & D.H. Hymes (eds.), Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 346 -380.
- _____ (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In G. Psathas (ed.), Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology. New York: Irvington. 23-78.
- Schmidt, R. (1986). Applied sociolinguistics: The case of Arabic as a second language. Anthropological Linguistics. 28, 1, 55-72.
- Schwarz, E. & Ezawa, R. (1985). Everyday Japanese. Illinois: Passport Books.
- Scollon, R. (1993). Maxims of stance: Channel, relationship, and main topic in discourse (Research Rep. No. 26). Hong Kong: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, Department of English.
- Sifianou, M. (1989). On the telephone again! Differences in telephone behaviour: England versus Greek. Language in Society. 18, 527-544.
- Trudgill, P. (1974). Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Appendix*call 1*

A - S: Hello

C - K: Moshi moshi. Sumida?

A - S: Hai.

C - K: Saka desu. Konbanwa.

[

A - S: Konbanwa.

Kinou wa doumo arigatou

gozaimashita.

[

C - K:

Iie. Iie. Kochira koso. Ano....

call 2

A - Ku: Moshi moshi. Hata desu.

C - K: Hata-san? Saka desu.

Konnichiwa.

[

A - Ku:

Konnichiwa.

C - K: Ano, otayori itadakimashita

no. Arigatou gozaimashita.

Mezurashikute, oishiimono o.

[

A - Ku:

Ah sou desu ka? Kochira koso.

C - K: Iie. Yorokonde itadaketamitai de....

A - Ku: Nanka....

call 3

A - K: Hello..... Hello....

C - N: Moshi moshi.

A - K: Hai.

C - N: Moshi moshi.

A - K: Hai.

C - N: Ah! Saka-san no okusan desu ka?

A - K:

Ahh! Ishikawa Sensei!

C - N: Hai. Boeidaigakuno

Ishikawa desu. Konbanwa.

[

A - K:

Konbanwa. Itsumo osewa ni narimasu.

[

C - N:

Gobusata sitemasu.

A - K: Kochira koso.

C - N: Ogenki desu ka?

A - K: Ee. Okagesama de. Nanka

Nihon wa samui toki itte imasu ga...

C - N: Ee. Koko 2, 3 nichi zuibun

samukunarimashita.

A - K: So, so desu ka?

C - N: Kesa, zuibun hiekomimashita.

A - K: Ano...ima, Saka desu ne....

call 4

A - N: Moshi moshi.

C - Y: Ano Saka desu.

A - N: Ah! Konnichiwa.

C - Y: Ah! Doumo. Hai. Ano,

okaeshi suru no ga osokunatte

sumimasendeshita. Go

[

A - N: Iie iie.

C - Y: busatashite orimasu.

A - N: Enshuu yattan desu ka?

C - Y: Hai. Chotto gakusei ga...

A - N: Nesshin desu ne.

C - Y: Iie, ano...

A - N: Keio no gakusei sotchii made itte yaru?

C - Y: Sou nan desu. Sore de

ano...??chyoudo issjukan.

call 5

A - S: Hello.

C - K: Sato-san?

Ohayou gozaimasu.

[

A - S: Hai. Ah doumo.

Ohayou gozaimasu.

C - K: Doumo. Kinou wa zutto itte

kudasatte, arigatou gozaimashita.

[

A - S:
Iie iie. Nakanaka kappatsuna ikeni ga.
C - K: Yaa.
[
A - S: Omoshirokatta desu yo.
C - K: Maa ne nanka ichiyo dai
seikou to iu kimochi de orimasu.
A - S: Ha(?) hontouni dai seiko
desu yo. Subarashii desu yo.
C - K: Yokatta hontouni... Ano ne
Kyou nan desu kedo...
A - S:
Hai.

call 6

A - J: Hello.
C - K: Mariko-san?
A - J: Hai.
C - K: Ano Saka desu kedo.
Ohayou gozaimasu. Kinou wa
doumo, arigatou gozaimashita.
A - J: Iie iie. Kochira koso.
C - K: Nanka okagesama de nanka
sietotachi wa manzokukan ippai
de...
A - J: Ah! Hontou ni
C - K: Tada ano...
[
A - J: Sugoi to iu ka, urayamashii
to iu ka?
C - K: Hm?
A - J: Sugoi te iu ka, urayamashii
to iu ka? Annani wakakute, annani
dekite, te iu ka?
C - K: Annani wakakute watashi
sotchi no hou ga... sa wakai te
sugoi to tsuku-dzuku
A - J:
Ii na?
C - K: Omoimashita yo. Hontou ni
A - J: Ne?
C - K: Mm.
A - J: Oshii desu.

C - K: Ne? Ano ne? Kyou nan desu kedo.

call 7

A - W: Hello.
C - Y: Moshi moshi. Saka desu.
Ohayou gozaimasu.
[
A - W:
Ohayou gozaimasu.
C - Y: Ano...kyou no ken desu
kedo. Basho nan desu ga.
A - W: A. Sucoshi omachi
kudasaimase.
C - Y: Ah. Hai.

*Caller speaks before his intended party indicates he has picked up the phone. Perhaps there was a noise made by the picking up of the phone itself that gave a signal to the caller.

C - Y: Moshi moshi. Saka desu.
Ohayou gozaimasu. Ano kyou no
softuboru no ten nan desu kedo.
Bashou mada...

call 8

A - S: Hello.
C - Y: Moshi moshi. Saka desu ga.
(Ano) Yano kun hai. Kono aida,
doumo arigatou
[
A - S:
AH! Saka Sensei desu ga.
C - Y: gozaimashita.
[
A - S: Iie, doumo kochira koso.
[
C - Y: Honto ne,
gakusei wa hijouni
yorokondemashite.

[

A - S:

Ee, doumo arigatou gozaimasu.

C - Y: Kinou nanka mo ne. Issho ne kite itdakereba motto hanashi ukagaeta noni. Mitaina koto o itterunomo ite. Hai. Sore de. Ano. Kyou nan desu ga.

call 9

A - K: Hello.

C - J: Moshi moshi.

A - K: Hai.

C - J: Ah! Morioka desu kere domo.

A - K: Ah! Hai. Ohayou gozaimasu.

[

C - J: Ohayou gozaimasu. Kinou wa doumo osewa ni narimashita.

A - K: Iie.

C - J: Arigatou goaimashita.

A - K: Uun. Minna de taihen urusakatta kara...

C - J: Iie. Demo hisashiburi ni tanoshikatta desu.

A - K: Ki ga wakaku narimasu ne.

C - J: Ano. Kinou ne. Osewa ni natte, (hoide) watashi ukkarishitan desu kedo. Ano. Ohiru no obentoudai o owatashishitenakatta....

call 10

A - T: Hello.

C - K: Sumida-san? Ohayou gozaimasu. Saka desu.

[

A - T: Hai.

A - T: Ohayou gozaimasu.

C - K: Hayakatta kana?

A - T: Tondemo arimasen. Ikaga desu ka guai wa?

C - K: Un. Okagesama de nodo no hou wa zutto okashiin dakedo,

karada no hou wa ne, daijoubu mitainan desu yo. Ano, kono aida, arigatou gozaimashita.

call 11

A - S: Hai.

C - A: Moshi moshi. Kobayashi-san no otaku desu ka?

A - S: Hai. Mina de gozaimasu.

C - A: Kurabe desu.

A - S: Oo. Konbanwa.

[

C - A: Konbanwa. (pause) Ano ne...

A - S: Hai.

call 12

A - S: Hai.

C - B: Moshi moshi. Ohayou gozaimasu.

[

A - S: Ohayo gozaimasu.

C - B: Yoji kimashita?

A - S: Ato ni san pun matte kudaisai.

call 13

A - C: Hai, moshi moshi.

C - S: Aa Kobayashi desu ke domo.

A - C: Hai.

C - S: Okaasan oraremasu ka?

A - C: Chotto matte kudasai.

C - S: Suminasen.

C - S: Konbanwa

A - D: Konbanwa.

C - S: Ano..(sucking air in noise) otoosan wa daijoubu deshita?

A - D: Ee, daijoubu desu. Arigatou gozaimasu.

C - S: Sore de mi..mikka kan desu dedo ne?

A - D: Hai.

C - S: Kinyoubi. Oisogashi desu ka?

A - D: Kinyoubi wa....ie. Daijoubu desu.

call 14

A - R: Hai Kobayashi desu keredomo.

C - E: Oo Mina Kobayashi-san irrashaimasu

A - R: Hai, chotto matte kudasai.

C - E: Hai, Thank you.

A - S: Hai.

C - E: Hai. Mina Kobayashi (cut the tape)

call 15

A - S: Hai.

C - F: Moshi moshi.

A - S: Kobayashi de gozaimasu.

C - F: Yamamoto desu.

A - S: Aa!

C - F: Konbanwa.

[

A - S: Konbanwa.

C - F: Kyou shigoto ga nai no yo!

[

A - S: AH!

A - S: E!

C - F: Laughs at the same time as

"E"! Zutto ichiji ni ittan no yo!

call 16

A - S: Hai.

C - G: Kobayashi-san?

A - S: Hai.

C - G: Tottori desu.

A - S: Ah! Itsumo osewa natte orimasu.

C - G: Sumimasen mo oyasumi datta deshou?

A - S: Iie. Ano okite orimasu node.

Chotto. Hai.

[

[

C - G:

Hotto oyasumi dattara

A - S: Iie, chotto mattte kudasaimase.

C - G: Chotto ne. Chotto o tei tei

tei ano oshigoto arimashite. Tada

ne oyasumi....muzukashite ne?

Hayaku oyasumi dattara.

A - T: Moshi moshi.

C - G: Moshi moshi.

A - T: Hai.

C - G: EEE YA! Doumo, Kobayashi-san?

A - T: Hai.

C - G: Gomen nasai. Mou... okoshichatta kashira?

A - T: Iie, ye ye. okite imasu yo!

C - G: Ima chotto...boku ne. Kaeta kitan desu kedo.

call 17

A - T: Moshi moshi. Kobayashi
desu ga.

C - H: Moshi moshi.

A - T: Hai.

C - H: Yamamoto de gozaimasu.

A - T: Ah! Ohayou gozaimasu.

Hai.

[

C - H: Ohayou gozaimasu.

Oyasumi desu ka?

A - T: Ee, kyou wa chotto ma ()
dekakemasu keredo.

C - H: Okusan wa?

A - T: Imasu. Chotto matte kudasai ne?

call 18

A - R: Hai.

C - I: Moshi moshi.

A - R: Hai.

C - I: Ano Iemoto desu ga.

A - R: Ah! Konnichiwa.

C - I: Konnichiwa.

A - R: Hai.

C - I: Otoosan imasu ka?

A - R: Ee? Chott- chotto matte

kudasai. (off to the side) Otoosan imasu ka?

call 19

A - J: Hello.

C - S: Ah! Konnichiwa. Kobayashi desu.

A - J: Hai, konnichiwa.

C - S: Sumimasen. Maki...mada

ha...desu ka? Itte imasu?

A - J: Mada.

call 20

A - S: Hai.

C - T: Otoosan desu kedo.

A - S: Hai.

C - T: Chotto osokunaru kara

call 21

A - R: Hai.

C - K: Kobayashi-san irrashaimasu ka?

A - R: Hai so desu keredomo.

C - K: Ano Ayasei no () Gima to
moshimasu desu keredomo.

Itsumo osewa natte orimasu.

[

A - R:

Hai. Ah! ...chotto omachi kudasai.

A - S: Hai.

C - K: Moshi moshi.

A - S: Ah! Gobusate shite orimasu.

[

C - K: Ano gobusate shite

imasu domo. Senjitsu wa iro iro

arigatou gozaimasu.

[

A - S:

Kochira koso. Arigatou gozaimasu.

C - K: Ogenki?

A - S: Ee. Okagesama de.

C - K: Aikawarazu. Gorufu yatte iru deshoushi.

A - S: Iie. Otonashii n desu yo.

C - K: Iie, iie. gozenchu odenwa shita mou (laughs)

A - S: Ah! Ano asa wa...chotto

comuniti no hou de...

call 22

A - R: Hai.

C - K: Ano, Gima de gozaimasu,
tabi tabi moshi age gozaimasen.

[

A - R: Ah!

Hai.

A - R: Iie, iie.... chotto matte

kudasai.

C - K: Osore irimasu.

A - S: Hai.

C - K: Gomen nasai tabi tabi de

[

A - S: Iie.

C - K: Ano ne? Ano ().

call 23

A - R: Hai, moshi moshi.

C - L: Murata desu ke domo.

A - R: Hai.

C - L: Yuki-san

A - R: Hai, chotto matte ne?

C - L: Hai.

A - C: Ano sa... (cut off)

call 24

C - M: Moshi moshi. (caller spoke first)

A - S: Hai.

C - M: Ah! Sumimasen. Ohayou
gozaimasu.

[

A - S: Ohayou

gozaimasu.

C - M: Oshima desu. Ano ne Kobayashi-san...

[

A - S: Ah!

C - M: Sumimasen, watashi kinou
robi iku te utan desu kedo...

A - S: Hai.

C - M: Kangaete mittan...

call 25

A - S: Hai.

C - T: Moshi moshi.

A - S: Hai.

C - T: Otoosan da kedo.
 A - S: Uun.
 C - T: Ano ne... hachi han goro owaru kara sa....

call 26

A - R: Hai, moshi moshi.
 C - N: Ah! Mina-san irrashaimasu ka?
 A - R: A...chotto ima dekakete imashite.
 C - N: Ano nanji goro kaimasu...
 A - R: E to...goji ni....

call 27

A - S: Hai
 C - O: Mina-san?
 A - S: Hai.
 C - O: Ogenki desu ka?
 A - S: Arigatou gozaimasu.
 C - O: Ano ne...E to omikan ga atta deshou?

call 28

A - R: Hai
 C - P: Moshi moshi.
 A - R: Hai.
 C - P: Higashi desu.
 A - R: A, Konbanwa:
 [
 C - P: Konbanwa.
 Okaasan...
 A - R: Hai, chotto omachi kudasai.
 A - S: Hai.
 C - P: Moshi moshi.
 A - S: Hai.
 C - P: Ah, Konbanwa.
 A - S: Ah, Konbanwa.
 C - P: Sumimasen, saki hodo wa nanka...

call 29

A - S: Hai.
 C - Q: Moshi moshi.
 A - S: Hai.
 C - Q: Konbanwa ----to (name) desu.
 A - S: Ah, Konbanwa.
 C - Q: Oisogashi desu ka? Ima?

A - S: Iie, daijoubu desu.
 C - Q: Daijoubu desu ka?
 A - S: Hai.
 C - Q: Ano ne....

call 30

A - U: (inaudible)
 C - S: Ohayou gozaimasu.
 A - U: Ohayou gozaimasu.
 C - S: Ano, Kobayashi desu ke domo.
 A - U: Hai.
 C - S: Itsumo doumo arigatou gozaimasu.
 A - U: Iie.
 C - S: E..to... ashita... onegai dekimasu.

call 31

A - S: Hai.
 C - V: Ohayou gozaimasu, Mina-san.
 A - S: A, ohayou gozaimasu.
 C - V: Nee...

call 32

A - R: Hai.
 C - W: Moshi moshi.
 A - R: Hai.
 C - W: Fukuda desu ke domo.
 A - R: A.
 C - W: Otoosan oraremasu?
 A - R: Hai, chotto omachi kudasai.

A - T: Hai, moshi moshi.
 C - W: Moshi moshi.
 A - T: Hai.
 C - W: Kore kara ikimasu....

call 33

A - S: Hai.
 C - X: Sumimasen, Koi desu.
 [
 A - S: Ah.
 C - X: Ima kaette kitta n desu kedo...
 A - S: Ah, so desu ka?
 C - X: Hai. Nanji goro dereba ii kana....

call 34

A - Y: Hai.

C - S: Ohayou gozaimasu.

A - Y: Ah, ohayou gozaimasu.

C - S: Otsukare sama deshita.

A - Y: Otsukare (laughs)

[

C - S: (laughs)

(2006年6月2日受理)